

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 1, 2 and 3 have been amended. Support for the amendments is found in the original application, in particular on page 24, line 18 to page 25, line 1 and page 25, lines 14-15 (claim 1), page 25, lines 23-25 (claim 2), and page 25, lines 16-17 (claim 3), respectively.

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-3 and 10-11 are directed to a polarizing member, claims 4-7 are directed to an illuminator, and claims 8-9 are directed to a liquid-crystal display device.

In this Office Action, claims 1 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not enabled. It is alleged in the Office Action that these claims do not recite sufficient structure to support the properties claimed.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 recites technical features of the polarizing member that make it possible to avoid or reduce hue variations. It is submitted that these properties are sufficiently illustrated and exemplified in the specification so that a person of ordinary skill in the art would be able to reproduce the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

In addition, claim 1 has now been amended to clarify the structure of the polarizing member.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by US 6,543,153 to Weber et al. (Weber), and claims 5-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Weber. It is alleged in the Office Action that Weber discloses a

polarizer having the transmission feature recited in claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Weber is directed to a coextruded multilayer polarizer which is a linear polarizer. Thus, Weber is completely silent regarding a laminate of an absorptive type polarizer, a circularly polarized light separating sheet and a quarter wave plate, let alone regarding a circularly polarized light separating sheet comprising cholesteric liquid-crystal layers in close and integral contact with one another, as recited in present claim 1.

In particular, in the embodiments of Weber, light is separated by a linear reflective polarizer made of the coextruded multilayer polarizing film disclosed in Weber (see in particular Figs. 9-10 and corresponding description from col. 8, line 44 to col. 9, line 42).

In contrast, an advantage of the presently claimed structure is that discoloration can be avoided and visibility in oblique view can be improved, as discussed and exemplified in the present application, for example on page 27, lines 16-20 of the specification. The features of the presently claimed invention and their advantages are not taught or suggested in Weber, and therefore, the present claims are not obvious over Weber.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No.: 020532

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

Customer No.: 38834

NES:rep